

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AMARILLO DIVISION

JAY ANTHONY NOTTINGHAM,
Institutional ID No. 01490726,
SID No. 2416038,

Plaintiff,

V.

ROBERT A. LOVE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

[illegible]

2:19-CV-108-Z-BQ

**ORDER ADOPTING THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the Court are the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge advising that this action be dismissed because Plaintiff failed to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and engaged in contumacious conduct. Plaintiff filed objections (ECF No. 43) on September 14 — sixteen days after receiving the Magistrate Judge’s findings, conclusions, and recommendation. Although untimely, this Court did review Plaintiff’s objections considering Plaintiff’s *pro se* status.

After making an independent review of the pleadings, files, and records in this case, Plaintiff's objections, and the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the Court concludes that the findings and conclusions are correct. In reviewing Plaintiff's objections, the Court found no evidence or argument addressing the Magistrate Judge's factual findings regarding the forged signatures on the pleadings.

The only legal argument Plaintiff brings is that the Magistrate Judge should have allowed Plaintiff to submit a corrected pleading with his signature under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a). But Plaintiff fails to understand that this is not a case of *unsigned* pleadings: it is a case of *forged* signatures.

Indeed, instead of refuting the Magistrate's findings, Plaintiff attacks the very integrity of the Magistrate Judge. Plaintiff accuses the Magistrate Judge of concocting "ludicrous claims" in a "last ditch effort to remove the Complaint from the docket." ECF No. 43 at 3-4. Accusations of impropriety by a Magistrate Judge are not to be brought lightly, and such accusations are hardly a winning litigation tactic. Magistrate Judges are the workhorses of the federal judicial system. Plaintiff is admonished to cease casting aspersions on the Court and its staff with no factual basis as such inflammatory language detracts from whatever legitimacy his claims may have.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are ADOPTED, and Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and all claims therein are dismissed without prejudice. It is further ORDERED that the pending Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 30) is denied as moot.

SO ORDERED.

September 30, 2020



MATTHEW J. KACSMARKYK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE